

Entropy and Conformal Field Theories of AdS_3 Models*Klaus Behrndt¹, Ilka Brunner¹ and Ingo Gaida²¹*Humboldt Universität Berlin, Institut für Physik,
Invalidenstrasse 110, 10115 Berlin, Germany.*²*DAMTP, University of Cambridge
Silver Street, Cambridge CB3 9EW, UK*

(April 1998)

Abstract

We present a derivation of the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy from conformal field theories. In particular we consider a six-dimensional string configuration with background metric $AdS_3 \times S^3$ near the horizon. In addition we introduce momentum modes along the string, corresponding to a Banados-Teitelboim-Zanelli (BTZ) black hole in the anti-de Sitter (AdS) space-time, and a Taub-NUT soliton in the transverse Euclidean space, projecting out a discrete subgroup of S^3 . This spherical part is described by a $\frac{SU(2)}{Z(m)}$ Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) model. The AdS_3 space-time, on the other hand, is determined by two conformal field theories living at the two boundaries: One $\frac{SL(2,\mathbf{R})}{U(1)}$ WZW model on the horizon of the BTZ black hole and one Liouville model at infinity. The extremal BTZ black hole interpolates between these two conformal field theories. Moreover, we argue that the sum of the three conformal field theories yields the correct microscopic state-counting including all α' corrections.

PACS: 04.70, 11.25.H

Keywords: Black Holes, Conformal Field Theory, Chern-Simons Theory.

Typeset using REVTeX

*Research supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).

Recently there has been a lot of interest in certain d -dimensional conformal field theories that can be described in terms of supergravity and/or string theory on the product of a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional anti-de Sitter (AdS) space with a compact manifold [1–5]. In this letter we use this property to derive from the near-horizon geometry of the six-dimensional fundamental string solution an exact formula for the extremal Bekenstein-Hawking entropy from conformal field theories (CFTs) including all α' corrections.

As our “master model” we consider the string configuration in six dimensions. Using U -duality we transform all charges into NS -charges and focus on four non-trivial charges. The general string solution has the following background metric in the string frame [6]

$$ds^2 = \frac{1}{H_1}(dudv + H_0 du^2) + H_2 \left(\frac{1}{H_3}(dx_4 + \vec{V} d\vec{x})^2 + H_3 d\vec{x} d\vec{x} \right) \quad (I.1)$$

with $v, u = z \pm t$ and $\vec{\nabla} \times \vec{V} = \vec{\nabla} H_3$. Every harmonic function parametrizes one brane:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= 1 + \frac{q_1}{r}: \text{the fundamental string} \\ H_0 &= 1 + \frac{q_0}{r}: \text{wave-modes along the string} \\ H_2 &= 1 + \frac{p^2}{r}: \text{(compactified) NS-5-brane} \\ H_3 &= 1 + \frac{p^3}{r}: \text{KK-monopole (Taub-NUT space)} \end{aligned}$$

Introducing polar coordinates, we find for the near-horizon geometry

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 &= \frac{r}{q_1} \left[-dt^2 + dz^2 + \frac{q_0}{r}(dz - dt)^2 \right] + p^2 p^3 \left(\frac{dr}{r} \right)^2 + \\ & p^2 p^3 \left[(d\zeta + (\pm 1 - \cos \theta) d\phi)^2 + d\Omega_2 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (I.2)$$

where $x^4 = p^3 \zeta$ and the “ $\pm$ ” ambiguity indicates the different choices for V for the north and south hemisphere. Thus, near the horizon $r = 0$ the six-dimensional space-time becomes a product space of two three-dimensional subspaces

$$M_6 = AdS_3 \times S^3/Z_m \quad (I.3)$$

The Euclidean space S^3/Z_m is described by a $SU(2)/Z(m)$ -WZW model (see [15] and reference therein), the discrete subgroup is projected out due to the KK-monopole ($\zeta \simeq \zeta + \frac{4\pi}{m}$). This model corresponds to an *exact* two dimensional conformal field theory (CFT) with level and central charge

$$k \equiv k_{SU} = \frac{p^2 p^3}{\alpha'} , \quad c_{SU} = \frac{3k}{k+2} - 1 . \quad (I.4)$$

Thus, in the classical limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ (or $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$) one obtains $c_{SU} = 2$. Since we have a compact group manifold k has to be quantized (positive integer). The non-compact three-dimensional space-time AdS_3 , on the other hand, represents the extreme Banados-Teitelboim-Zanelli (BTZ) black hole solution [7] for appropriate values of the charges with coordinates $x^\mu = (t, z, r)$. Starting from (I.1), we can perform the following coordinate transformation

$$t \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{2q_1}{l}} t \quad , \quad z \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{q_1}{2l}} z \quad , \quad r \rightarrow \frac{2r^2}{l} - q_0 \quad (I.5)$$

to obtain the metric:

$$ds^2 = -e^{-2V(r)} dt^2 + e^{2V(r)} dr^2 + \left(\frac{r}{l}\right)^2 \left(dz - \frac{lq_0}{2r^2} dt\right)^2 \quad (I.6)$$

with

$$e^{-V(r)} = \frac{r}{l} - \frac{q_0}{2r} = \frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{rl} \quad , \quad r_0^2 = \frac{lq_0}{2} \quad , \quad l^2 = 4p^2 p^3 \quad (I.7)$$

The metric (I.6) satisfies the boundary conditions given in [8] and is therefore asymptotically anti-de Sitter with radius l . The horizon of the BTZ black hole is located at $r = r_0$ and solves the three-dimensional Einstein-Hilbert action

$$S_{EH} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_3^2} \int_{AdS_3} d^3x \sqrt{-g} (R - 2\Lambda) \quad (I.8)$$

including a negative cosmological constant $\Lambda = -1/l^2$. In the limit $q_0 \rightarrow 0$ one obtains the empty space solution (AdS vacuum state) with metric

$$ds_{\text{vac}}^2 = -\frac{r^2}{l^2} dt^2 + \frac{l^2}{r^2} dr^2 + \frac{r^2}{l^2} dz^2 \quad (I.9)$$

In the context of our “master model” this vacuum solution is obtained if there are no wave-modes along the six-dimensional string configuration. Note that the vacuum solution and the “standard” AdS_3 metric

$$ds_{AdS_3}^2 = -\left(\frac{r^2}{l^2} + 1\right) dt^2 + \left(\frac{r^2}{l^2} + 1\right)^{-1} dr^2 + \frac{r^2}{l^2} dz^2 \quad (I.10)$$

are globally inequivalent (for a detailed discussion see [7,2]). The BTZ black hole can be parametrised by a dreibein e (with components e_μ^a). Here we choose the following dreibein e with inverse e^{-1} (with the components e^μ_a)

$$e = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-V} & -r_0^2/rl & 0 \\ 0 & r/l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^V \end{pmatrix}, \quad e^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} e^V & 0 & 0 \\ e^V r_0^2/r^2 & l/r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-V} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (I.11)$$

It is known that gravity in $2+1$ dimensions is equivalent to Chern-Simons theory [9,10], where the gauge group is the AdS diffeomorphism group $SO(2,2) \sim SL(2, \mathbf{R})_R \times SL(2, \mathbf{R})_L$, i.e.

$$S_{EH} = S_{CS}[A] - S_{CS}[\bar{A}] \quad (I.12)$$

with

$$S_{CS}[A] = \frac{k}{4\pi} \int_{M_3} d^3x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \text{Tr} (A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho + \frac{2}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho) \quad (\text{I.13})$$

Strictly speaking, this form of the Chern-Simons action is only valid for models on a closed three-manifold M_3 . Here we consider $M_3 = \mathbf{R} \times \Sigma$, where $\mathbf{R}$ corresponds to the time of the covering space of AdS_3 and Σ represents an “annulus” $r_0 < r < \infty$. In order to obtain a well-defined Chern-Simons action additional boundary terms must be introduced. These boundary terms have an important consequence. Chern-Simons theory on a closed manifold is purely topological, which is easily seen from (I.13), since it does not require a particular metric. Furthermore, connections A which differ only by a gauge transformation lead to the same contribution to the path integral. However, introducing boundaries “would-be” gauge degrees of freedom become dynamical at the boundaries. The gauge connections of the Chern-Simons action are related to the Einstein-Hilbert action by [9]

$$A = (\omega^a + \frac{1}{l} e^a) T_a, \quad \bar{A} = (\omega^a - \frac{1}{l} e^a) \bar{T}_a. \quad (\text{I.14})$$

Here $\omega^a = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{abc} \omega_{bc}$, where ω_{bc} denotes the spin-connection one-form. Moreover, $(T_a, \bar{T}_a)$ are the generators of two $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ Lie algebras with

$$T_0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{I.15})$$

satisfying

$$[T_a, T_b] = \epsilon_{ab}^{c} T_c, \quad [T_a, \bar{T}_b] = 0, \quad \text{Tr}(T_a T_b) = \frac{1}{2} \eta_{ab} \quad (\text{I.16})$$

with $\eta = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1)$ and $\epsilon^{012} = 1$. The spin connections are obtained by solving

$$de^a + \omega^a_{b} \wedge e^b = 0$$

We choose conventions where the three-dimensional gravitational coupling is related to the level k by

$$k = \frac{2\pi l}{\kappa_3^2} = \frac{p^2 p^3}{\alpha'}. \quad (\text{I.17})$$

After some tedious calculations one obtains for the gauge connections coming from the extremal BTZ black hole

$$\begin{aligned} A^0 &= \frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{r l^2} dv, & \bar{A}^0 &= \frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{r l^2} du, \\ A^1 &= \frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{r l^2} dv, & \bar{A}^1 &= -\frac{r^2 + r_0^2}{r l^2} du, \\ A^2 &= \frac{r^2 + r_0^2}{r^2 - r_0^2} \frac{dr}{r}, & \bar{A}^2 &= -\frac{dr}{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.18})$$

or, equivalently, with $T_\pm = T_1 \pm T_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{rl^2} dv T_+ + \frac{r^2 + r_0^2}{r^2 - r_0^2} \frac{dr}{r} T_2 , \\
\bar{A} &= \left(\frac{r^2 - r_0^2}{rl^2} \bar{T}_0 - \frac{r^2 + r_0^2}{rl^2} \bar{T}_1 \right) du - \frac{dr}{r} \bar{T}_2 .
\end{aligned}
\tag{I.19}$$

It can be checked that the field strength $F = dA + A \wedge A$ as well as $\bar{F}$ vanish and, therefore, these connections are pure gauge

$$A = g^{-1} dg \quad , \quad \bar{A} = \bar{g}^{-1} d\bar{g} \tag{I.20}$$

with $g \in SL(2, \mathbf{R})_R$ and $\bar{g} \in SL(2, \mathbf{R})_L$. To understand this from a different point of view, let us take the chirality conditions $A_u = \bar{A}_v = 0$ as boundary conditions. They can be implemented consistently by adding an appropriate term to the Chern Simons action. The variation of this additional boundary term has to cancel the boundary term coming from the variation of the Chern-Simons action, such that the variation of the total action does not receive corrections from the boundary. In the Chern Simons action, the temporal components of the gauge connection $(A_t, \bar{A}_t)$ appear as Lagrange multipliers enforcing the constraint $F_{rz} = \bar{F}_{rz} = 0$ (see e.g. [11]). This constraint is satisfied by the extremal BTZ black hole solution. Moreover, since in our particular model the gauge fields depend only on the coordinate r , all other field strength components vanish, too.

It follows that the Chern-Simons model or, equivalently, the extremal BTZ black hole can be rewritten as a WZW-model [12]

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{WZW}[g] &= \frac{k}{8\pi} \int_{\partial M_3} d^2x \operatorname{Tr} [(g^{-1} \partial_\mu g)(g^{-1} \partial^\mu g)] + \frac{k}{12\pi} \Gamma[g] \\
\Gamma[g] &= \int_{M_3} d^3x \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \operatorname{Tr} [(g^{-1} \partial_\mu g)(g^{-1} \partial_\nu g)(g^{-1} \partial_\rho g)] .
\end{aligned}
\tag{I.21}$$

where $g \in SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ depends only on the boundary coordinates. g is now dynamical variable. However, not all gauge degrees of freedom are dynamical. We are still left with a residual gauge invariance. As a consequence we have to consider a coset model rather than a full $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ WZW model. The particular form of the coset depends on the boundary considered (see also [13]). In our model we have two boundaries, one at the horizon of the BTZ black hole ($r = r_0$) and another one at infinity. Both boundaries are parameterized by (u, v) . The non-vanishing gauge fields $(A_v, \bar{A}_u)$ become

on the horizon : $r = r_0$	at infinity : $r \rightarrow \infty$	(I.22)
$A_v = 0 \quad , \quad \bar{A}_u = \frac{-2r_0}{l^2} \bar{T}_1$	$A_v = \frac{r}{l^2} T_+ \quad , \quad \bar{A}_u = \frac{r}{l^2} \bar{T}_-$	

To fix all gauge degrees of freedom, we have to fix the T_1 -component of $\bar{A}_u$ at the boundary at $r = r_0$ and the T_+ component of A_v and the $\bar{T}_-$ component of $\bar{A}_u$ at the boundary at $r \rightarrow \infty$. Alternatively, one can implement the correct boundary conditions directly in the WZW model. First, one adds up both chiral WZW-models to one non-chiral $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ model. Next, since the gauge fields are pure gauge, the boundary conditions (I.22) become constraints of the $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ -currents of the (non-chiral) WZW-model. These constraints can be taken into account by gauging the corresponding group direction. Note that one has two *different* boundary conditions at the two boundaries. It follows that there are also two

different CFT's at each boundary.

(i) *The outer boundary.* Here, the boundary conditions (I.22) yield constraints on the currents of the WZW-model:

$$J_v^+ = -\frac{k}{2}\text{Tr}(T_+g^{-1}\partial_v g) = \text{const}, \quad J_u^- = -\frac{k}{2}\text{Tr}(T_-g^{-1}\partial_u g) = \text{const}. \quad (\text{I.23})$$

Imposing these constraints, the $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ is truncated to a Liouville model [16,18,17,14] with central charge

$$c_L = \frac{3k}{k-2} - 2 + 6k. \quad (\text{I.24})$$

This truncation corresponds to a gauged WZW-model, where a lightlike direction has been gauged, i.e. to a $\frac{SL(2, \mathbf{R})}{O(1,1)}$ WZW model.

(ii) *The inner boundary.* Here, the boundary condition does not fix a lightlike group direction, but a spacelike. So we have to consider a $\frac{SL(2, \mathbf{R})}{U(1)}$ WZW model, where the $U(1)$ corresponds to the T_1 direction. The central charge in this case is

$$c_{SL} = \frac{3k}{k-2} - 1 \quad (\text{I.25})$$

Note that this is not the “standard” gauged WZW model, instead the non-vanishing boundary conditions yield non-vanishing but fixed WZW currents.

Putting it all together the six-dimensional model (I.2) is determined by a superposition of three conformal field theories. Two of them are living on each boundary of AdS_3 and one takes the S_3/Z_m space into account. In order to obtain the total central charge we must add up all contributions and obtain

$$c_{tot} = c_{SU} + c_{SL} + c_L = \left(\frac{3k}{k+2} - 1\right) + \left(\frac{3k}{k-2} - 1\right) + \left(\frac{3k}{k-2} - 2 + 6k\right). \quad (\text{I.26})$$

Thus, the complete entropy is given

$$S = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}c_{tot}N}. \quad (\text{I.27})$$

To compare this result with the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy, we will embed our model in the heterotic superstring theory. Thus, we will consider the corresponding Super-CFT. The corresponding modifications are straightforward: In the $SU(2)$ model we have to replace k by $k-2$ and in the $SL(2)$ models by $k+2$. In addition one has to add $1/2$ for every fermionic mode. It follows that the total superconformal central charge has the general form

$$c_{tot} = 6k + \beta + \frac{\gamma}{k}, \quad (\text{I.28})$$

Note, however, that the total central charge of our master model, for which $\gamma = 6$, has a $k \leftrightarrow 1/k$ symmetry and, therefore, there is a lower bound for k : c_{tot} becomes minimal at $k = 1$. It is interesting to note, that in the case of double-extreme black holes (i.e. for constant scalar fields) this bound yields also a bound for the BPS-mass. In the classical

limit the double-extreme BPS mass vanishes for vanishing charges and the classical black hole solution “disappears”. However, our result indicates, that one obtains the lowest possible value of the mass for $k = 1$, corresponding to $p^2 p^3 = \alpha'$. This is an interesting result and deserves further investigations.

The oscillator number N can be obtained from the level matching condition. The mass of elementary heterotic string states are given by

$$M_{BPS}^2 \sim N_L - 1 + \frac{1}{2}p_L^2 = \frac{1}{2}p_R^2 = \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{q_0}{R} + q_1 R\right)^2 \quad (\text{I.29})$$

Here, $N_L \geq 0$ are number operators and (p_L, p_R) is a vector in the Narain lattice and, in terms of the integer valued momentum [winding] quantum number q_0 [$-q_1$], $p_{L,R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\frac{q_0}{R} \mp \frac{q_1 R}{\alpha'}\right)$. Thus, one obtains

$$N = N_L = 1 + \frac{q_0 q_1}{\alpha'}. \quad (\text{I.30})$$

It follows that the entropy of the string configuration is given in the BPS limit by

$$S = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}\left(1 + \frac{q_0 q_1}{\alpha'}\right)\left(6k + \beta + \frac{\gamma}{k}\right)} \quad (\text{I.31})$$

with $k = \frac{p^2 p^3}{\alpha'}$. Here β and γ are fixed by the fermionic contributions.

Hence we found the exact microscopic form for the entropy of the six-dimensional string configuration in the BPS limit including *all* α' corrections. Compactification to four dimensions yields the microscopic form for the corresponding black hole configurations. For a detailed discussion we also refer to [4].

In the limit of large q_0 our result should yield the Maldacena-Strominger-Witten formula [19,20]

$$S = 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{q_0(6D + c_{2A}p^A)}{6}}. \quad (\text{I.32})$$

if $D = p^1 p^2 p^3$ and $c_{2A} = c_{21} = \beta$. Indeed, in the large q_0 limit we obtain $N_L = \frac{q_0 q_1}{\alpha'}$ and, performing the symplectic transformation $q_1 \rightarrow p^1$ in order to map the type II result to the heterotic side, both results coincide for large k . Moreover, in the classical limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ (or $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$) one obtains

$$S_{\text{classical}} = 2\pi \sqrt{q_0 D}, \quad c_{\text{classical}} = 6k. \quad (\text{I.33})$$

It follows that the classical entropy is given by large N_L and the central charge of the Liouville model, only. Note that this result holds for supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric central charge of the Liouville model.

Moreover, it is straightforward to generalize the results to an $O(m, n)$ invariant form (see [21] for example):

$$q_0 q_1 \rightarrow \vec{Q} L \vec{Q}, \quad p^2 p^3 \rightarrow \vec{P} L \vec{P}, \quad \vec{P}, \vec{Q} \in O(m, n). \quad (\text{I.34})$$

Here L denotes the $O(m, n)$ metric. Thus, one obtains

$$N_L = \vec{Q}L\vec{Q} + 1, \quad \text{and} \quad k = \frac{\vec{P}L\vec{P}}{\alpha'}. \quad (\text{I.35})$$

In summary, we have shown that the six-dimensional string configuration yields a product space near the horizon $r = 0$. This product space yields four WZW models at the boundaries, which can be reformulated as three different conformal field theories. This result can be used to find the relevant microscopic quantum states giving a statistical interpretation to the macroscopic Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Here, we computed the exact entropy in the BPS limit including all α' corrections from CFTs. One important result of this letter is that we found one $\frac{SL(2, \mathbf{R})}{U(1)}$ gauged WZW model at the inner boundary B_0 , i.e. at the horizon of the BTZ black hole, and two chiral WZW models at the outer boundary B_∞ giving rise to one Liouville model [14,13]. The extreme BTZ black hole interpolates between these two boundaries with their CFTs. We argued that the sum of all CFTs, living at the boundaries of the near-horizon space-time, yields the correct microscopic state-counting procedure. Thus, we follow the general idea that the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy should be accounted for by microstates near the horizon [22,2]. Note that we only considered the leading order contributions to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. In general there are further subleading (logarithmic) contributions [23].

One should keep in mind, that our total central charge is not fixed by the total central charge of the conformal anomaly of heterotic superstring theory. As pointed out before the crucial point is that we discussed *only boundary* CFT's. Since the Liouville field parametrises radial fluctuations of AdS_3 it resembles very much the old discussion that non-critical string theory in d dimensions becomes critical in $d + 1$ dimensions. In this context the Liouville field compensates for the d -dimensional matter central charge. For a discussion on these issues we refer also to [3].

This letter motivates the following picture on the location of the microscopic states that are encoded in the four-dimensional Bekenstein-Hawking entropy. Classically ($k \rightarrow \infty$) the only contribution to the entropy comes from the Liouville model living at the outer AdS boundary. It is suggestive to understand this boundary as the mouth region of the black hole throat geometry. But this is not the whole story, since additional subleading contributions come from states located at the bottom of the throat, which are independent of the Liouville mode.

It would be very interesting to obtain additional macroscopic examples including all α' corrections. In fact, currently we prepare another article on the general setup presented in this letter including further details and extensions.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank A. Tseytlin, T. Mohaupt, S. Förste, T. Turgut and M. Walton for discussions.

Note added:

While writing this letter we received [24,25] which have some overlap with aspects of our work.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Claus, R. Kallosh, A. Van Proeyen, [hep-th 9711161](#);
J. Maldacena, [hep-th 9711200](#);
S.-J. Rey, S. Theisen and J.-T. Yee, [hep-th 9803135](#);
H. Liu and A.A. Tseytlin, [hep-th 9804083](#),
- [2] A. Strominger, [hep-th 9712251](#)
N. Kaloper, [hep-th/9804062](#).
- [3] S.S. Gubser, I.R. Klebanov and A.M. Polyakov, [hep-th/9802109](#)
- [4] K. Sfetsos and K. Skenderis, [hep-th 9711138](#);
H.J. Boonstra, B. Peeters and K. Skenderis, [hep-th 9803231](#).
- [5] E. Witten, [hep-th 9802150](#), [hep-th 9803131](#);
- [6] M. Cvetič and D. Youm, *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 584, [hep-th/9507090](#);
M. Cvetič and A.A. Tseytlin, *Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 5619, [hep-th/9512031](#).
- [7] M. Banados, C. Teitelboim and J. Zanelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** (1992) 1849;
M. Banados, M. Henneaux, C. Teitelboim, J. Zanelli, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 1506
- [8] J.D. Brown and M. Henneaux, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **104** (1986) 207.
- [9] A. Achúcarro and P.K. Townsend, *Phys. Lett.* **B180** (1986) 89.
- [10] E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B311** (1988/89) 46.
- [11] S. Elitzur, G. Moore, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg, *Nucl. Phys.* **B326** (1989) 108.
- [12] E. Witten, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **92** (1984) 455.
- [13] T. Lee, [hep-th/9706174](#)
- [14] O. Coussaert, M. Henneaux, P. van Driel, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **12** (1995) 2961.
- [15] D.A. Lowe and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73** (1994) 1468.
- [16] A.M. Polyakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A2** (1987) 893;
V.G. Knizhnik, A.B. Zamolodchikov, A.M. Polyakov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A3** (1988) 819;
- [17] R. Dijkgraaf, H. Verlinde, E. Verlinde, *Nucl. Phys.* **B371** (1992) 269.
- [18] A. Alekseev and S. Shatashvili, *Nucl. Phys.* **B323** (1989) 719.
M. Bershadski and H. Ooguri, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **126** (1989) 49.
P. Forgacs, A. Wipf, J. Balog, L. Feher, L. O’Raifeartaigh, *Phys. Lett.* **B227** (1989) 214;
- [19] J. Maldacena, A. Strominger, E. Witten, *JHEP* **12** (1997) 002.
- [20] K. Behrndt, G.L. Cardoso, B. de Wit, D. Lüst, T. Mohaupt, W.A. Sabra, [hep-th 9801081](#);
- [21] M. Cvetič, I. Gaida, *Nucl. Phys.* **B505** (1997) 291, and reference therein.
- [22] W.H. Zurek and K.S. Thorne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54** (1985) 2171;
G. ’t Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B335** (1990) 138,
L. Susskind, L. Thorlacius, R. Uglum, *Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 3743;
S. Carlip, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 632;
- [23] K. Behrndt and I. Gaida, *Phys. Lett.* **B401** (1997) 263;
K. Behrndt, G.L. Cardoso and I. Gaida, *Nucl. Phys.* **B506** (1997) 267,
- [24] J. Maldacena and A. Strominger, [hep-th 9804085](#);
- [25] E.J. Martinec, [hep-th 9804111](#);